



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Western Investment Co. (1911) 221 U. S. 286, 31 Sup. Ct. 578, see *Matter of Heff* (1905) 197 U. S. 488, 509, 25 Sup. Ct. 506; and may in other cases exercise ancillary control over subject matter which has passed beyond its direct jurisdiction, in order to insure the carrying out of its intentions. *McDermott v. Wisconsin* (1913) 228 U. S. 115, 33 Sup. Ct. 431; see *Hipolite Egg Co. v. United States* (1911) 220 U. S. 45, 31 Sup. Ct. 364. It is submitted that the Act in question is an instance of the exercise of such power, and hence should be sustained.

CONTRACTS—AGREEMENT TO PROCURE GOVERNMENT CONTRACT—PUBLIC POLICY.—The plaintiff agreed with the defendant uniform manufacturer to procure government contracts, his compensation to be two per cent of the amount received by defendant from the government. *Held*, the contract was void as being in contravention of public policy. *Beck v. Bauman* (1918) 105 Misc. 584, 173 N. Y. Supp. 772.

It has been the policy of the courts to declare invalid contracts which involve or imply the resort to improper means in influencing governmental action, *Veazey v. Allen* (1903) 173 N. Y. 359, 66 N. E. 103, whether exercised by legislative bodies or administrative departments. See *Providence Tool Co. v. Norris* (1864) 69 U. S. 45, 55; *Hazelton v. Sheckells* (1905) 202 U. S. 71, 79, 26 Sup. Ct. 567. Political pressure and social solicitation are recognized as such improper means, see *Marshall v. Baltimore & O. Ry.* (1853) 57 U. S. 314, and contracts for lobbying services have never been upheld. *Hyland v. Oregon Hassam Paving Co.* (1914) 74 Ore. 1, 144 Pac. 1160; *Crichfield v. Bermudez Asphalt Paving Co.* (1898) 174 Ill. 466, 51 N. E. 552. On the other hand, it is clear on theory and authority that agreements for legitimate professional services are valid. So contracts have been upheld in which a plaintiff was to make bids to a city and use honest efforts for procuring street paving contracts for the defendant company, *Durham v. Hastings Paving Co.* (1900) 56 App. Div. 244, 67 N. Y. Supp. 632, *aff'd.* without opinion in 189 N. Y. 500, 81 N. E. 1163; but *cf.* *Crichfield v. Bermudez Asphalt Paving Co.*, *supra*; where an agent's work was to draft a bill, openly to explain it to a legislative committee, and to ask to have it introduced, *Chesborough v. Conover* (1893) 140 N. Y. 384, 35 N. E. 633; and where a broker procured government contracts for a blanket manufacturer. *Winpenny v. French* (1869) 18 Oh. St. 469. In none of these cases was personal influence required or intended; and although where the compensation for the services are contingent upon success, the inference may be strong that improper methods are to be attempted, see *Providence Tool Co. v. Norris*, *supra*, such contracts are not necessarily invalid. *Cf.* *Faltz v. Cogswell* (1890) 86 Cal. 542, 25 Pac. 60; *Chesborough v. Conover*, *supra*; *Durham v. Hastings Paving Co.*, *supra*; *Oscanyan v. Winchester Arms Co.* (1880) 103 U. S. 261. In the principal case it is, however, to be inferred that the work of the plaintiff was not solely to apprise the governmental department of the merits of the military equipment manufactured by the defendant, but to bring influence personal or political to bear on the officials to secure the contract; and his compensation being entirely contingent on the success of his services there is an added element pointing to the invalidity of the agreement. The decision reached, therefore, is sound and especially so in view of the extraordinary conditions at the time which demanded a total absence of any sinister tampering with the activities of the government in its prosecution of the war.